

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/790,038	03/02/2004	Nobuhito Suehira	249566US2CONT	9746		
22850	22850 7590 12/16/2005			EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			THOMAS, LUCY M			
	1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2836			
			DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· .)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ú
	10/790,038	SUEHIRA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lucy Thomas	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appreciation approach for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailting date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> ·		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.		
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowa			
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 48	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application) .		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	and the Plane of the Samuel		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/c	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
1: Certified copies of the priority document		·	
2/ Certified copies of the priority document		· -	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio		ed in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	ad.	
occ the attached detailed office detail for a list	of the defined copies not reserve		
Attachment(s)	-		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Description Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413) ate.	
 Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/02/2004</u>. 		ratent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2836

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumar et al. (US 5,880,924). Regarding Claim 1, Kumar discloses a charge eliminating mechanism for a stage 20 for a work-to-be-processed 12 (Figure 4), comprising: a grounded wiring line having a first end and a second end, the second end being grounded (see grounded line Figure 4); and a mechanical switching mechanism (see 165 in Figure 4) arranged between the stage and the first end of the wiring line (Column 4, lines 26-32, Column 7, lines 37-57). Regarding Claim 7, Kumar discloses a testing apparatus (see apparatus in Figures 4, 7), comprising the charge eliminating mechanism, which tests electrical characteristics of a work-to-be-processed 12.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2836

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilrose (US 6,878,233).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding Claim 1, Hilrose discloses a charge eliminating mechanism for a stage 1 for a work-to-be-processed W (Figures 1-2, 4-6, Column 4, lines 37-41, Column 5, lines 55-65 Column 6, lines 60-64), comprising: a grounded wiring line having a first end and a second end, the second end being grounded (see grounded line in block 8 in Figure 1, in block 12 in Figures 2,4, block 28 in Figures 5-6); and a mechanical switching mechanism (see 8b in Figure 1, 12b in Figures 2, 4) arranged between the stage and the first end of the wiring line. Regarding Claim 2, Hilrose discloses a

Art Unit: 2836

charge eliminating mechanism, wherein the work-to-be-processed W is a work to be tested, and the wiring line includes a resistor (8c, 8d in Figure 1, 12c, 12d in Figures 2, 4 and alternatively 28b, 28c in Figures 5-6) between the first and second ends.

Regarding Claim 3, Hilrose discloses a charge eliminating mechanism for a stage, wherein the mechanical switching mechanism of charge eliminating system comprises: a contact terminal including a contact terminal main body 8b, 12b, a third end, and a fourth end (see block 8 in Figure 1 and block 12 in Figures 2, 4 for open ends of the switch), the fourth end being electrically connected to the first end of the wiring line, and a contact state between the third end and the stage being physically turning on/off, and when the third end is in contact with the stage, the stage grounded through the third end of the contact terminal, the contact terminal main body, the fourth end, the first end of the wiring line, a resistor, and the second end of the wiring line (Column 5, lines 62-65, Column 6, lines 60-64).

Regarding Claim 7, Hilrose discloses a testing apparatus (see apparatus in Figures 1-2, 4-6), comprising the charge eliminating mechanism, which tests electrical characteristics of a work-to-be-processed (Figures 3A-3C for testing results, Column 1, lines 65-67, Column 2, 1-7, 40-63, Column 5, 7-15, Column 7, lines 45-57). Claims 8-9 recite the elements of Claims 2-3 for the testing apparatus comprising the charge eliminating mechanism instead of charge eliminating mechanism. Therefore, please see the rejection for Claims 2-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2836

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 4-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilrose (US 6,878,233) in view of Puerto et al. (US 6,778,258). Regarding Claim 4, Hilrose does not disclose a charge eliminating mechanism, wherein at least one of the contact terminal and the stage includes an elastic contact mechanism to cause the third end of the contact terminal and the stage to come into elastic contact with each other. Puerto discloses a stage 230 for wafer processing and contact terminals which include an elastic contact mechanism to cause the contact terminal and the stage to come into elastic contact with each other (see contact block 225, contacts 226, 227 and contact pads 228, 229 in Figure 2B, Column 6, lines 51-64). It would have been obvious to those skilled in art at the time the invention was made to modify Hilrose's charge eliminating mechanism to provide a an elastic contact mechanism as taught by Puerto, because elastic contacts guarantee good electrical connection for testing and processing of wafers in semiconductor industries.

Regarding Claim 5, Puerto discloses the charge eliminating mechanism, wherein the stage 230 is rotable in forward and reverse directions (see Figure 2B), and the elastic contact mechanism provided on the stage is a plate (provided with 228, 229) with spring properties formed on a top side surface of the stage (Column 6, lines 58-60).

Claim Regarding Claim 6, Puerto discloses that the elastic contact mechanism provided

Art Unit: 2836

on the contact is a POGO pin (Column 6, lines 54-66). Claims 10-12 recite elements of Claims 4-6 for the testing apparatus comprising the charge eliminating mechanism instead of charge eliminating mechanism. Therefore, please see the rejection for Claim 4-6.

2. Claims 2-3 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar et al. (US 5,880,924) in view of Poli et al. (US 5,280,979). Regarding Claim 2, Kumar discloses a charge eliminating mechanism, wherein the work-to-be-processed 12 is a work to be tested. Kumar does not disclose a resistor between the first and second ends of the wiring line. Poli discloses a charge eliminating mechanism (Figure 1), wherein the work to be processed is a work to be tested, and the wiring line includes a resistor 4 between the first and second ends (see resistor in Figure 2A). It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar's charge eliminating mechanism to include a resistor in the wiring line as taught by Poli, because resistor protect the circuits on the work-to-be processed from damage due to rapid discharge of electrostatic charge.

Regarding Claim 3, Kumar discloses the charge eliminating mechanism, wherein the mechanical switching mechanism (switch 165) of charge eliminating system comprises: a contact terminal including a contact terminal main body, a third end (adjacent electrode 85), and a fourth end (adjacent voltage supply 170) (see switch 165 and its parts in Figure 4, electrode 85, conductor element 140), the fourth end being electrically connected to the first end of the wiring line, and a contact state between the third end and the stage being physically turning on/off, and when the third end is in

contact with the stage, the stage grounded through the third end of the contact terminal, the contact terminal main body, the fourth end, the first end of the wiring line, and the second end of the wiring line (Column 3, lines 16-22, 32-37, Column 4, lines 60-67, Column 6, lines 29-58). Claims 8-9 recite the elements of Claims 2-4 for the testing apparatus comprising the charge eliminating mechanism instead of charge eliminating mechanism. Therefore, please see the rejection for Claims 2-3.

8. Claims 4-6 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar et al. (US 5,880,924) in view of Poli et al. (US 5,280,979) and Puerto et al. (US 6,778,258). Regarding Claim 4, both Kumar and Poli do not disclose the charge eliminating mechanism, wherein at least one of the contact terminal and the stage includes an elastic contact mechanism to cause the third end of the contact terminal and the stage to come into elastic contact with each other. Puerto discloses a stage 230 for wafer processing and contact terminals which include an elastic contact mechanism to cause the contact terminal and the stage to come into elastic contact with each other (see contact block 225, contacts 226, 227 and contact pads 228, 229 in Figure 2B, Column 6, lines 51-64). It would have been obvious to those skilled in art at the time the invention was made to modify Kumar's and Poli's charge eliminating mechanism to provide a an elastic contact mechanism as taught by Puerto, because elastic contacts guarantee good electrical connection for testing and processing of wafers in semiconductor industries.

Regarding Claim 5, Puerto discloses the charge eliminating mechanism, wherein the stage 230 is rotatable in forward and reverse directions (see Figure 2B), and the

Art Unit: 2836

elastic contact mechanism provided on the stage is a plate (provided with 228, 229) with spring properties formed on a side surface of the stage (Column 6, lines 58-60). Claim Regarding Claim 6, Puerto discloses that the elastic contact mechanism provided on the contact is a POGO pin (Column 6, lines 54-66). Claims 10-12 recite elements of Claims 4-6 for the testing apparatus comprising the charge eliminating mechanism instead of charge eliminating mechanism. Therefore, please see the rejection for Claim 4-6.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lucy Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-6002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on 571-272-2058. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PHUONG T. VU PRIMARY EXAMIN